R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 085 CG 000 247

INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COUNSELOR AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PARTICIPATION IN GROUP COUNSELING.

BY- SHAW, MERVILLE C.

PUB DATE MAR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.72 18P.

DESCRIPTORS- *GROUP COUNSELING, TEACHER RESPONSE, COUNSELING EFFECTIVENESS, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, GROUPS, SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS, SPEECH THERAPISTS, SCHOOL NURSES, SPEECHES, DALLAS

THIS RESEARCH EXAMINES THE DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE WHICH EXISTS BETWEEN COUNSELOR AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF GROUP COUNSELING. THIRTY COUNSELING GROUPS COMPOSED OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS, SCHOOL COUNSELORS, SPEECH THERAPISTS, AND NURSES WERE FORMED, UTILIZING ALL INDIVIDUALS OTHER THAN TEACHERS AS GROUP LEADERS. TWO SERIES OF GROUP COUNSELING SESSIONS WERE CONDUCTED (FALL AND SPRING) IN WHICH THE MAIN THEME WAS A DISCUSSION OF ISSUES AND PROBLEMS OF TEACHERS IN THEIR DAILY WORK. REACTIONS WERE OBTAINED FROM ONLY THE TEACHERS AND COUNSELORS BY A QUESTIONNAIRE FOLLOWING EACH SERIES OF GROUP COUNSELING SESSIONS. CORRELATIONS OF THE DATA COLLECTED REVEALED THAT COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS OF RAPPORT PARALLELED THE MEMBERS' REACTIONS TO THE HELPFULNESS OF THE SESSIONS. OTHER FINDINGS WERE THAT (1) COUNSELORS PERCEIVED POSITIVE OUTCOMES ONLY WHEN THERE WAS LITTLE DIFFERENCE OF OPINION AMONG GROUP MEMBERS ABOUT RECOMMENDING GROUP PARTICIPATION TO THEIR PEERS, (2) TEACHERS FELT THE GROUP DISCUSSIONS HAD BEEN HELPFUL WHEN THE COUNSELOR FELT NO INSISTENCE USING A LECTURE APPROACH, AND (3) THERE IS A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COUNSELOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPACT OF GROUP COUNSELING ON CHILDREN AND TEACHER FEELINGS THAT THE GROUPS HAVE BEEN HELPFUL. A HIGH DEGREE OF CONGRUENCE EXISTS BETWEEN COUNSELORS AND TEACHERS RELATIVE TO THEIR EXPERIENCES IN THE GROUPS. THIS PAPER WAS PRESENTED AT THE AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION (DALLAS, MARCH 21, 1967). (RL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012085

Interrelationships between Counselor and Teacher Perceptions of Their Participation in Group Counseling[1]

A Speech Presented at the 1967 Annual Convention of APGA

by
Merville C. Shaw

Public school guidance personnel ordinarily think primarily in terms of providing services directly to children. This point of view is well illustrated in a recent position taken by the American School Counselor Association to the effect that school counselors should spend a minimum of 50% of their time in providing direct counseling services to children. (Laughary, et al, 1965) Similar points of view appear to prevail within the ranks of school psychologists and school social workers. It appears, however, that if guidance services are to have any significant impact on any large segment of the student population, then new means of providing services must be developed. In the field of school psychology this point of view has been dramatically stated by both Trachtman and Gray. Gray (1963) has indicated the need to discover new ways for the school psychologist to work effectively; while Trachtman (1961) has suggested that it will be necessary for the school psychologist to consider the school as his client rather than individual children. School social work, too, has moved away from a previous position, which, in effect, was that everything occurring outside the school was in the province of the school social worker (Cook, 1945), to a more generalized kind of position (Kelley, 1964). As a matter of fact, it does not seem unreasonable to state that among those who appear to be in the forefront of the thinking in each of these three professions there is a distinct trend toward increasing similarity of function among the various guidance professions (Shaw, 1967).

While there is agreement, at least among a few of the more advanced thinkers in the general area of guidance, that the role of the guidance specialist in providing direct services to children will probably be altered in the future, theoretical models delineating this position and the presuppositions involved are generally nonexistent. A rudimentary effort in this direction has appeared in the literature (Shaw and Tuel, 1966). The model suggested by Shaw and Tuel attempts to make the case for the guidance specialist as an expert in bringing about environmental modifications, both in the home and the school, which result in more effective learning on the part of students.

The data included here are a part of that which has been collected specifically to provide at least a partial test of this kind of model. The two basic experimental steps which have been taken to date include the provision of opportunities for parents in selected grades in participating schools to become involved in parent counseling groups. Some of the data collected on this phase of the project have been reported previously (Shaw and Rector, 1966). The second phase of the model which has been experimentally implemented has been the provision of group counseling to volunteer groups of teachers in participating schools. It is a part of the data which have resulted from this latter phase of the project which is presented here.

---

[1]This research is part of a larger project supported by funds administered by the Interprofessional Research Commission on Pupil Personnel Services.

CG 000 247

Formation of Teacher Groups

Attempts to form counseling groups for teachers were made in a total of thirty schools in five districts. Schools included were two high schools, three junior high schools and twenty-five elementary schools. Groups were successfully formed in twenty-three of the thirty schools. In some schools, the amount of teacher response made it necessary to form more than one group. The range of participation was from 0 in those schools in which it proved impossible to form groups to as high as 100% of the available teachers. It should be emphasized that these were volunteer groups and no pressure was applied to teachers to participate. Teachers were informed that the purpose of the groups was to provide a situation in which they could discuss professional problems which they encountered in their daily work. No attempt was made to delineate what these problems might be with the single exception that teachers must discuss issues and situations which they, as individuals, could influence or change.

Design

Complete reports on the rationale and design of the total project have been presented elsewhere (Shaw and Tuel, 1964, Shaw and Tuel, 1965). For this reason, only those procedures specifically relevant to the teacher groups will be reported here. It was decided at the outset that all teachers in participating schools would have an opportunity to participate in two series of group counseling meetings, each series to consist of five sessions. The first series of teacher discussion groups were initiated in the fall, not longer than four weeks after the beginning of the parent discussion series which were also being carried out in the same school. The second series was initiated in the spring within four weeks after the beginning of the second semester. All teacher participation was voluntary.

Project consultants (who were in every case employees of the participating school district) met with the faculties of the thirty schools originally included to inform them of the general kinds of information coming from the parent group discussions and to invite teachers to participate in the teacher group counseling series. A faculty meeting was also utilized prior to the initiation of any teacher groups in order to administer the instruments used to evaluate outcomes of the teacher groups. These instruments were administered to <u>all</u> teachers so that data could be obtained from teachers who did not participate as well as those who participated in the teacher groups.

Arrangements with respect to time and place of meetings were left entirely to the discretion of the individual who had the responsibility of eliciting teacher participation. A wide variety of times were used, but the two most frequently used times were the hour immediately before school began or the hour immediately after school was dismissed for the day. Unique scheduling arrangements in a few schools permitted some teacher groups to meet during the actual school day.

Training in group process was provided to the teacher group leaders, but no attempt to control specific counselor behaviors was made. The two limitations imposed on a counselor functioning within the groups was that the meetings could not be didactic and that the areas of discussion must be limited to those over which individual teachers had control. The main thrust was to be an emphasis on discussion of issues and problems of general concern to teachers in their professional life. Discussions of school policy or other matters not within the

capacity of an individual to influence directly were discouraged. The counselors were provided with a series of possible group discussion topics in case they encountered difficulty in obtaining group participation. This was done, however, more to provide security for the counselors than for any other reason. There was no agenda, apart from issues which the participants themselves wished to bring up for consideration.

Individuals utilized as teacher group counselors included school psychologists, school social workers, school counselors, speech therapists and nurses. No problems relevant to professional specialization were encountered during the course of the research.

Interrelationships between Counselor and Teacher Responses

Although the general aims of the study were quite broad, one of the sub-objectives was to determine the extent to which the counselors and the teacher participants agreed in their perception of certain process and outcome variables. The assertion is frequently made that counselor perceptions of what happened in group counseling are invalid and that therefore such data are not helpful in our understanding of whether or not such experience is beneficial. It is the purpose of the present report to examine this issue in an objective way.

In order to accomplish this, each teacher who participated in a group was asked to complete a Post-Series Reaction Sheet (Appendix A). This brief form was intended to elicit significant teacher reactions to their participation in the group counseling experience. Each counselor was also asked to respond to a form at the completion of each group. This form was called the Counselor Reactions to Specific Group and a copy appears in Appendix B. All counselors also completed a General Counselor Reaction Form following the conclusion of their participation in the study. A copy is included in Appendix C. While these forms provide a great deal of data and in general indicate highly favorable counselor and teacher reaction to their participation in the group process, the main purpose of this report is to examine the degree of congruence which existed between counselor and teacher perceptions of their mutual experience.

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the Post-Series Reactions of Teachers

Tables 1 through 4 report on the nature of the relationships between items from the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the Post-Series Reaction Sheet responses of teachers. Tables 1 and 2 represent the correlations between counselor responses to specific groups and the group means obtained from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. Tables 3 and 4 represent the correlations between the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the individual responses of teacher participants in counseling. It should be noted that the n is considerably smaller for Tables 1 and 2, since these represent correlations between group means and counselor responses rather than correlations between counselor responses and the individual responses of teachers. Hence, the magnitude of the correlation coefficient required to achieve significance is considerably higher for these two tables. It should also be emphasized that the magnitude of the correlation required for significance in the spring is considerably higher than that required to attain significance in the fall groups, again because of the fact that the number of groups is considerably smaller in the spring than in the fall.

Correlations revealed by Table 1 indicate significant relationships between

Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Item 1 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. Thus, counselor perceptions of rapport in the group parallel the reactions of group members with respect to the helpfulness of the group counseling. Significant relationships also obtain between Item 1 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and Item 6 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups. Again, there appears to be a relationship between teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of group counseling and the relative positiveness of counselor feeling about outcomes in the group. A further significant relationship exists between Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Item 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. This finding indicates a high degree of relationship between counselor perceptions of rapport within the groups and teacher willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to other teachers. A further significant correlation exists between Item 6 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Item 4 from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. This would indicate a strong relationship between counselor feelings about group outcomes and teacher willingness to recommend participation in similar groups to fellow teachers.

It is significant to note that the counselor responses which are related strongly to teacher responses are those which deal with the concept of rapport and counselor perceptions of outcomes. It is equally important to note that the concepts of interaction and hostility did not relate to any teacher perceptions. This may well indicate that the terms "rapport" and "outcome" have some stable meaning for counselors which the terms "interaction" and"hostility" do not have. There is one final significant correlation in this table. This is the standard deviation for Item No. 4 on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet and its relation to Item No. 6 on the Counselor Reaction to Specific Groups. This correlation indicates that counselor attitudes about group outcomes are related to the amount of variance of counselee response to Item No. 4. Thus, the counselor may be reacting to the unanimity of response on the part of the group. That is to say, counselors tended to perceive outcomes as positive only when there was little difference of opinion among members of the group with respect to recommending participation in a similar group to their peers.

Table 2 reports similar results for the spring groups. Two of the correlations found to be significant on the basis of analysis of results from the fall groups also are significant in the spring. These are the relationships which exist between Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups relative to rapport and Item 1 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet dealing with the helpfulness of group discussion. The other correlation significant in the spring which was also significant in the fall is that which exists between Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Item 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet dealing with the teacher's recommendation of participation in group counseling to other teachers. This finding further strengthens the idea that the concept of rapport has some stable meaning for counselors which is related to the positiveness of teacher perceptions of their group experience.

Several new relationships appear. These include the correlation between Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the standard deviation of Item 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. This latter correlation fell just short of significance during the fall. In addition, Item 1 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the standard deviation of Item 1 on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet are significantly correlated. Additional significant correlations in the spring include Item 6 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and Item 2 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet, as well as the correlation between Item 6 of Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the standard deviation of Item 1 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. In spite of a somewhat changed

pattern of correlations in the spring groups, it is still obvious that the items with meaning to the counselors are Item No. 1 dealing with rapport and Item No. 6 dealing with the counselors' feelings about group outcomes. There is something about these items which assists counselors in making statements about the groups which are congruent with the perceptions of participants that the items relative to interaction and hostility do not have.

The pattern of correlations changes somewhat when emphasis is on the responses of individuals rather than on the mean responses of groups. Table 3 reports correlations obtained in this manner from counselors and counselees participating in group counseling during the fall series. The number of correlations found to be significant is considerably higher here, but again it should be emphasized that this may in part be an artifact related to the higher n utilized in computing degrees of freedom. Item 1 on the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups correlates significantly with Items 1, 2, 3a and 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. This finding indicates a strong relationship between counselor perceptions of rapport and teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the discussions, positiveness or negativeness of outcomes, positiveness and negativeness of behavior changes in children and teacher willingness to recommend participation in a similar group to their fellow teachers.

Item 2 on the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups correlates with only one item on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. This is Item No. 4 dealing with teacher willingness to recommend participation in similar groups. Item 3 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups is significantly correlated with three of the items from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. These include Item No. 1 dealing with the helpfulness of group discussions, Item No. 3 dealing with recent changes in child behavior and Item 4 dealing with teacher recommendations for participation. Item 5 on the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups correlates significantly with Item 1 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheets and Item 4 as well. Thus, teachers tended to feel that group discussions had been helpful when the counselor felt that there had been no insistence on a lecture approach by him, and teachers tended to recommend participation in a similar group when counselors perceived that the group did not insist on a didactic approach.

Item 6 on Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups dealing with counselor perceptions about group outcomes correlated significantly with Items 1 and 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet dealing respectively with teacher perceptions of the helpfulness of the discussions and their willingness to recommend participation in group counseling to fellow teachers. It should be noted that the counselor item relating to their perceptions of rapport tends to have a higher degree of relationship with teacher perceptions than any of the other items on the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups. This is a finding in line with what was discovered when correlations were run on group means rather than individuals.

Table 4 reflects results obtained when correlations between the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the Post-Series Reaction Sheets are computed on the basis of individual responses for the spring groups. It should be pointed out that five of the six significant correlations obtained in this way were also significant when computed for the fall group. Correlations of Item 3a from the Post-Series Reaction Sheet with all of the items of Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups proved impossible to compute because there was no variance of response. In this instance, responses were unanimously positive.

The one new significant correlation which appears in this data which did not appear in the fall data is the correlation between Item 3 of the Post-Series

Reaction Sheet and Item 6 of the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups. This is the first instance in which there has been a significant relationship between general counselor feelings about group outcomes and teacher perceptions of changes in pupil behaviors.

Relationships between General Counselor Reactions and the Post-Series Reaction Sheets

A major statistical problem exists with respect to the correlations being reported upon here. This problem resides in the fact that there was so little variance in the responses to questions 1 and 2 of the General Counselor Reactions that the correlations between these two items and the items of the Post-Series Reaction Sheets are, of necessity, extremely low, and in some instances were so low that a 0 divisor in the formula occurred and the correlation coefficient could therefore not be computed. When blanks occur in the following four tables, it is because of this latter fact.

Tables 5 and 6 report the results of correlations computed on the basis of group means for both fall and spring. The only significant correlation occurred in the fall group between Item 3 of the General Counselor Reactions and Item 3 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet, indicating that teachers and counselors were in agreement in their perceptions of whether or not teacher counseling groups resulted in behavior changes in children.

Significant correlations based on data obtained in the spring are considerably more numerous, although again they pertain only to Item 3 of the General Counselor Reactions. In this instance, there are correlations between this item and Items 1, 3 and 4 of the Post-Series Reaction Sheet, as well as correlations between standard deviations of Items 3 and 4. These results would indicate that when counselors perceive that work with teacher groups had an impact on children that teachers also feel this way and also perceive the groups as having been helpful when counselors see the groups as having resulted in changes in children's behavior. Further, there is a relationship between counselor perceptions of the impact of group counseling on children and the relative positiveness or negativeness of results of participation in group counseling as perceived by the teachers. Table 6 reports these results.

Tables 7 and 8 report the results of correlations obtained on the General Counselor Reactions and the Post-Series Reaction Sheet based on individual response rather than group means. Again, there are no correlations significant for either question 1 or question 2 of the General Counselor Reactions, but there are some significant correlations between Item 3 of this scale and some items on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet. There is a relationship between counselor perceptions of impact on pupils and teacher belief that changes in children's behavior in the classroom have occurred. This holds true both in the fall and the spring with correlations significant at the .01 level. In addition. there is a correlation significant at the .01 level between counselor perceptions of impact on children and teacher feelings that the groups have been helpful. This was found on the spring data only.

Discussion of Intercorrelations between Counselor and Teacher Perceptions

The data presented here indicate some very clear congruences between counselor and teacher responses. It seems generally reasonable to state that when counselors

have favorable perceptions of the rapport which existed in a group, the teachers tend to perceive group counseling as helpful. It is also reasonable to take the position that the data support the idea that when counselors perceive group outcomes to have been positive, then teachers perceive the groups to have been helpful to them. The reverse is also true. It is also true that when counselors perceive the groups as having been helpful, then teachers are willing to recommend participation in similar groups to their fellow teachers.

When individual rather than group responses are examined, the number of significant correlations rises. As stated previously, this is probably an artifact arising from the lower correlations required to achieve significance when larger n's are used. Again, however, the concept of "rapport" as perceived by counselors tends to relate more frequently to teacher perceptions than any other concept. In the data obtained in the fall, the concept of "hostility" which has little relationship to other variables, except in this instance, also tends to relate to certain teacher perceptions. The concept of "interaction" remains essentially unrelated to other teacher perceptions, while the concept of "outcomes" does tend to relate quite well with teacher perceptions both in the fall and spring. The concepts of rapport and outcome have a meaning for counselors which is reflected in teacher perceptions of the group, while the concepts of hostility and interaction do not. Some of the correlations between the counselor perceptions reflected in the Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups and the standard deviations of teacher responses may indicate that counselors tended to be in agreement with teachers more when there was a unanimity of opinion among the teacher group.

A lack of variance on the first two items of the General Counselor Reactions form resulted in a failure to discover any significant correlations between these two items and the items of the Post-Series Reaction Sheets. However, there was more variance on Item 3 and significant correlations between this item and some items on the Post-Series Reaction Sheet were found. It is interesting to note that the number of significant correlations is higher in the spring than the fall (five to one when correlations of groups means were performed). Whether this is due to the fact that some teachers who participated in the spring had also previously participated in the fall is at the moment impossible to say. It is significant to note, however, that counselor perceptions of the extent to which the groups did or did not have an impact on children is significantly related to a variety of teacher perceptions about the groups, including their perceptions with respect to whether or not the groups had an impact on children.

In summary, it can be said that a high degree of congruence between the perceptions of teachers and of counselors relative to their experiences in the groups has been demonstrated. The concepts of "rapport" and"outcome" as viewed by the counselors were especially highly related to teacher perceptions of the import of the groups in student behavior and their general feelings of positiveness or negativeness toward their group experience. It does not seem unreasonable to assume that under proper conditions group counselors in other settings also will see process and outcome variables in a manner similar to the way in which they are seen by group participants.

References

Cook, Katherine M. The place of visiting teacher services in the school program. Bulletin No. 6, 1945, Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Gray, Susan. The psychologist in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963.

Kelley, J. L. Present practices in school social work. In H. W. Lundberg (Ed.) School social work. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Laughary, J. W., Stripling, R. O., & Fitzgerald, P. W. Counseling, a growing profession. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1965.

Shaw, M. C. Role delineation among the guidance professions. Psychology in the Schools, 1967, 4, 3-13.

Shaw, M. C. and Rector, W. H. Parent and counselor perceptions of their participation in group counseling, Monograph #3, Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, Chico State College, Calif., October, 1966.

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. A proposed model and research design for pupil personnel services in the public schools, Monograph #1, Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, University of California at Los Angeles, March, 1964.

Shaw, M. C. and Tuel, J. K. Guidance research in action: group counseling with parents, Monograph #2, Western Regional Center of IRCOPPS, University of California at Los Angeles, April, 1965.

TABLE 1

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS AND TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS BY GROUPS: FALL

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups	Post-Series Reaction Sheets									
	1	s.d. of 1	2	s.d. of 2	3	s.d. of 3	3a	s.d. of 3a	4	s.d. of 4
1	.654**	-.164	.328	-.293	-.045	.266	.427	-.018	-.508*	-.418
2	.136	.196	.230	-.194	-.393	.252	.201	-.044	-.259	-.147
3	-.431	-.007	.165	-.212	.025	-.274	.050	-.260	.216	.175
5	-.299	-.138	.123	-.131	-.011	-.174	.079	.067	.369	.229
6	.484*	-.126	.277	-.301	(-.010)	-.141	.534*	.139	-.555*	-.606*

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS AND TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS BY GROUPS: SPRING

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups	Post-Series Reaction Sheets									
	1	s.d. of 1	2	s.d. of 2	3	s.d. of 3	3a	s.d. of 3a	4	s.d. of 4
1	.603*	-.645*	-.411	.443	.212	-.052	.248	.248	-.755**	-.746**
2	-.124	-.377	-.250	.272	.077	.202	-.408	-.408	-.418	-.418
3	-.120	.460	.116	.008	-.413	.208	.163	.163	.188	.188
5	-.096	.004	-.241	.349	.347	.320	-.533	-.533	-.430	-.430
6	.387	-.565*	.726*	-.544	(.403)	-.446	-.742*	-.742*	-.167	-.167

* Significant at .05 level.

** Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 3

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS AND TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS BY INDIVIDUALS: FALL

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups	Post-Series Reaction Sheets 1	2	3	3a	4
1	.325**	.181*	.011	.309*	.325*
2	.119	.134	-.125	.110	-.207*
3	-.199*	.062	.182*	-.004	.181*
5	-.210*	.039	-.089	.071	.265**
6	.222*	.095	(.098)	.243	-.278**

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUPS AND TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS BY INDIVIDUALS: SPRING

Counselor Reactions to Specific Groups	Post-Series Reaction Sheets 1	2	3	3a	4
1	.331*	-.095	.205	***	-.338*
2	-.108	-.140	-.043	***	-.296
3	-.075	-.193	-.330*	***	.099
5	.192	-.153	.147	***	-.302*
6	.424**	.231	(.476**)	***	-.122

* Significant at .05 level.

** Significant at .01 level.

*** Divisor approximately zero due to negligible variance in response to General Counselor Reactions; not computed.

TABLE 5

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS AND GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS BY GROUPS: FALL

Post-Series Reaction Sheets	General Counselor Reactions 1	2	3
1	-.180	-.180	-.022
s.d. of 1	-.228	-.228	-.403
2	-.015	-.015	-.037
s.d. of 2	-.024	-.024	.038
3	.097	.097	.446*
s.d. of 3	.039	.039	.056
3a	.174	.174	-.007
s.d. of 3a	.108	.108	.180
4	.205	.205	.122
s.d. of 4	.220	.220	.145

TABLE 6

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS AND GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS BY GROUPS: SPRING

1	***	***	.480*
s.d. of 1	***	***	-.401
2	***	***	.011
s.d. of 2	***	***	-.137
3	***	***	.558**
s.d. of 3	***	***	-.437*
3a	***	***	.218
s.d. of 3a	***	***	.218
4	***	***	-.516*
s.d. of 4	***	***	-.516*

* Significant at .05 level.

** Significant at .01 level.

*** Divisor approximately zero due to negligible variance in response to General Counselor Reactions; not computed.

TABLE 7

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS AND GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS: FALL

Post-Series Reaction Sheets	General Counselor Reactions 1	2	3
1	-.084	-.084	.097
2	.085	.085	.112
3	-.091	-.091	.352**
3a	.141	.141	***
4	.058	.058	-.034

TABLE 8

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN TEACHER POST-SERIES REACTION SHEETS AND GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS BY INDIVIDUALS: SPRING

1	***	***	.367**
2	***	***	.256
3	***	***	.608**
3a	***	***	***
4	***	***	-.219

* Significant at .05 level.

** Significant at .01 level.

*** Divisor approximately zero due to negligible variance in response to General Counselor Reactions; not computed.

Appendix A

Teacher_____
School_____
Consultant_____

Group No._____
Series No._____

POST-SERIES REACTION SHEET
(Teacher)
GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California at Los Angeles

For several weeks you have been participating in group discussions. We would like to know your reactions to this experience in order to plan for the future. Will you please respond frankly to the attached rating scale so that the reactions of all participants may be objectively evaluated. Should you run out of space, please feel free to continue on the back of this sheet or use additional paper.

1. Do you feel that the group discussions have been helpful to you?

Not at all* * * * *Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

1a. If you checked 3, 4, or 5 above, please explain briefly in what ways the discussions have been helpful.

2. Have there been bad or negative results from your participation in the group discussions?

Not at all* * * * *Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

If you checked 3, 2, or 1 above, please explain briefly what negative results occurred.

3. Have there been any recent changes in your pupils' behavior in class and other school situations?

Not at all* * * * *Very much so
1 2 3 4 5

3a. If you checked 3, 4, or 5 above, have these changes been for the better_____(or) worse_____
Please explain briefly the nature of these changes.

4. Would you recommend participation in a similar group to fellow teachers who have pupils with academic problems? yes_____
no_____

5. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be <u>least</u> helpful (or possibly harmful)?

6. What specific aspects of the group discussions did you find to be <u>most</u> helpful?

7. Please write here and on the back any feelings or reactions about your experience in this group which you have not had an opportunity to express above.

Appendix B

IMPORTANT! One of these forms is to be completed for each group at the conclusion of each series.

NOTE: When used for teacher group, observe substitutions in parentheses above text.

Consultant _____

District _____

School _____

Group Number _____ Parent ____ Teacher ____

(Circle) Series: 1 2 3

Date This Series Started: _____

COUNSELOR REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC GROUP

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. How would you describe rapport in this group?

(Circle one)	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

(teachers)

2. How much interaction was there among parents in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3. How much hostility was expressed in this group?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

4. (Answer only if answer to above question was 3, 4 or 5.) Was this hostility directed primarily towards

(Circle one)	Self	Counselor	(Parents) Teacher(s)	(Own Pupils) Own Child	Other Group Members
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

5. Did the group seem to insist that you talk or lecture to them?

(Circle one)	Almost None	Very Little	A Fair Amount	Quite A Bit	A Great Deal
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

6. What is your feeling about outcomes in this group?

(Circle one)	Poor	Not So Good	Fair	Very Good	Excellent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

7. In a short paragraph, characterize this group and put down your reactions to it. (Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.)

Appendix C

TEACHER GROUPS
FORM

IMPORTANT: This form is to be completed once only after the close of the last group session for the school year. The parallel form for parents should also be completed.

CONSULTANT_____
DISTRICT_____
LEVEL: Elem. Jr.Hi. Sr.Hi.
(Circle one)

GENERAL COUNSELOR REACTIONS

GUIDANCE RESEARCH PROJECT
University of California, Los Angeles

1. Would you recommend working with teacher groups as an effective technique to other counselors?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

2. Would you like to see a program of teacher group counseling introduced in your own guidance system (assuming appropriate shifts in load)?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Yes, But With Many Reservations	Yes, But With Some Reservations	Yes	Enthusiastically Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3. Do you feel that your work with teacher groups had any impact on their pupils?

(Circle One)	Definitely No	Probably No	Uncertain	Probably Yes	Definitely Yes
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

3a. If "yes" (4 or 5), please describe some of the kinds of outcomes you believe occurred.

4. In a paragraph or two, please summarize your major reactions to your teacher group counseling experience this year. Use back of sheet or extra paper if necessary.